



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

VII.—*The Thank-offering and Greek Religious Thought*

BY PROFESSOR JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

OF all types of sacrifice that have prevailed among men, the thank-offering, at its purest, is probably the highest and noblest. If at the root of all sacrifice lies the desire to "get right with God," to secure, by one means or another, the *pax deorum*, the thank-offering, in its purest form, does this with the least admixture of unworthy motives.

It need scarcely be said that the thank-offering is the result of an evolution; elsewhere<sup>1</sup> I have tried to trace some of its steps, and even to recapitulate the process is beyond my present scope and intention. I shall call attention only to certain aspects of the rite which have a more especial bearing on my present subject.

Apparently the thank-offering is far from a primitive form of sacrifice. Nor is gratitude, its emotional basis, a primitive emotion. It has often been pointed out that savages are to a remarkable degree lacking in gratitude, and that, in the moral development of the race, gratitude enters only late. But to the travellers' accounts of savage ingratitude Westermarck<sup>2</sup> takes exception. His criticism does succeed in weakening the charge by throwing doubt on its universal application, but he does not succeed in breaking it down. And the lack of real gratitude in savage religion Westermarck seems to admit when he says<sup>3</sup> "The savage is not so irrational as to make offerings to beings from whom he expects no benefits in return." For a real thank-offering is not prospective; it is, rather, retrospective. Again, Westermarck says<sup>4</sup> that on the Gold Coast worship is the result, not only of fear, but of the hope of getting direct advantage or protection. Here, too, the true thank-offering has no place. Yet in somewhat quali-

<sup>1</sup> "On the Development of the Thank-offering among the Greeks," *T.A.P.A.* XLIII, 95 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, II, 155.

<sup>3</sup> *Ib.* 614.

<sup>4</sup> *Ib.* 615.

fied language he goes on to maintain that even savages make sacrifices of thanksgiving to their gods, for instance,<sup>5</sup> in Fiji "a kind of thank-offering" was "sometimes presented to the deities." This there is no reason to question, for some savages have reached a higher stage of religious development than others, — after all, "savages" is a very loose and ambiguous term and may include men in very different degrees of civilization, — but certain of the rites mentioned by Westermarck may equally well be something else. "When certain natives of Eastern Central Africa . . . return home laden with venison . . ., they know that they are indebted to 'their old relative' for their good fortune, and give him a thank-offering."<sup>6</sup> This looks like ancestor-worship,<sup>7</sup> which does not usually take the form of thank-offering, but is inspired rather by the desire to keep on good terms with beings possessing such powers for ill. If the "thank-offering" to "their old relative" consisted, as seems likely, of a bit of the venison, we might compare the Roman sacrifice of a fragment of the meal to the Lar,<sup>8</sup> or the offering of the first bite of all food and the first swallow of all drink to the Lettish deity Ceroklis,<sup>9</sup> neither of which rites seems to have been a thank-offering, though it might easily become such. It seems to me that Westermarck is much nearer the truth when he goes on to say<sup>10</sup> "Yet we have reason to suspect that the gratitude of the sacrificer is commonly of the kind which La Rochefoucauld defined as 'a secret desire to receive greater benefits in the future,' " *i.e.* is more correctly precautionary, conciliatory, or propitiatory, or is even, as Westermarck goes on to hint, merely the payment of a previously made vow, — almost a purely business transaction, which contains little more gratitude than is felt by him who pays his baker's bill.

Of course, with moral advancement, gratitude appears, and, ultimately, though not necessarily at once, the thank-

<sup>5</sup> *L.c.*<sup>6</sup> *L.c.*<sup>7</sup> Compare the Russian custom of giving a bit of food and drink to the dead at the memorial meal; Schrader, *Die Indogermanen*, 134.<sup>8</sup> Ovid, *Fasti*, vi, 305 f.; Hor. *Odes*, iv, 5, 33 ff.; Reinach, *Orpheus*, 214.<sup>9</sup> Schrader, *op. cit.* 54.<sup>10</sup> *Op. cit.* 615 f.

offering comes into being. The speed of their evolution varies with the character of the people. Among the ancient Romans, gratitude was not a prominent characteristic.<sup>11</sup> But in time they came not only to feel gratitude but to give it expression in their religious rites, though not so fully, nor so early as Fowler seems to think, for I cannot agree with him in finding any considerable element of gratitude in the *votum*.<sup>12</sup> In early Rome, as in most early worship, the thank-offering was far from prominent; it was a slow development and matured late.<sup>13</sup>

I have tried to show in another paper<sup>14</sup> that the origin of the thank-offering in Greece was, in a sense, almost fortuitous, — that something or other, in several instances scarcely more than accident, gave a tone of thanksgiving to a rite of quite a different character. But, of course, without some pre-disposing cause, not that turn, but some other, would have been given to the payment of the vow, to the sacrificial banquet, to the sacrifice of propitiation. That pre-disposing cause must have been a changing idea of God, which made, for example, a rite of thanksgiving grow where a rite of propitiation had been before. God is no longer sinister, but friendly; the proper attitude toward him is not terror, but affectionate respect. Without such a change of attitude, the rite of thanksgiving could scarcely have found an atmosphere in which it could live and flourish.

And yet I believe not only that the idea of God profoundly influenced the origin and development of the rite, but that the rite had a distinct retroactive effect on the idea of God. Repeated sacrifices of this type gave that idea a fulness of

<sup>11</sup> Fowler, *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 252.

<sup>12</sup> *Op. cit.* 202.

<sup>13</sup> *Op. cit.* 267, n. 16. The elaborate *supplicationes* decreed as expressions of joy and described especially by Caesar, Cicero, and Livy, must not mislead us. Their name indicates their originally propitiatory character. See Walde, *Lat. etym. Wörterb.* s. v. Several early instances are definitely called propitiation. See Livy, III, 7, 7; cp. 5, 14. They became feasts of thanksgiving (*Id.* xxx, 17, 6) probably because they were the fulfilment of vows offered at the beginning of a war (*Id.* xli, 21, 11).

<sup>14</sup> *T.A.P.A.* XLIII, 95 ff.

content and a sharpness of outline it could not have had before; it stabilized the all too fleeting notion of the advanced thinker; it furnished him a form in which he might express the precious thought which would otherwise have been lost from his own consciousness, and a vessel in which he might transmit it to others. With a glimpse of new and loftier notions of God it furthered the more salutary type of anthropomorphism, the reflection in deity, not of man's weaknesses and foibles, but of his excellences. Diodorus<sup>15</sup> says that among the Druids no sacrifice was made without the participation of a philosopher, διὰ γὰρ τῶν ἐμπείρων τῆς θείας φύσεως ὥσπερ ἐκ τινῶν ὁμοφώνων τὰ χαριστήρια τοῖς θεοῖς φασὶ δεῖν προσφέρειν καὶ διὰ τούτων οἶονταί δεῖν τὰγαθὰ αἰτεῖσθαι.<sup>16</sup> He thus recognizes a close connection between a true and worthy knowledge of God and this loftiest type of sacrifice. The connection is one of reciprocal cause and effect. The loftier notion of God, attained by some thoughtful man, gave the first impulse to the rite, but for the shallower mass of men it was the rite that taught the lesson. And even for the thinker, the regular or recurrent practice of the ritual, like that of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, must have enhanced the depth and influence of the ideas that lay at the root of the ceremony.

One important and beneficent result of the thank-offering lay in the fact that it afforded an outlet for a highly moral and wholly laudable emotion, but one which might easily find too little exercise in the field of religion. It is a general, though, of course, not an inevitable, tendency of worship to confine itself to harmful and malevolent deities. The motive of sacrifice is all too often fear, and it is sometimes chiefly those deities which inspire fear that receive sacrifice. In the following words, quoted by Professor Hopkins from the *Mahābhārata*, we see how little of disinterested sacrifice such a religion could contain: "Men worship Çiva, the destroyer, because they fear him; Vishnu, the preserver, because they

<sup>15</sup> Diod. v, 31, 4.

<sup>16</sup> Compare the two acts of worship distinguished in Plato, *Euthyphro*, 14 C: τὸ θύειν δωρεῖσθαι ἐστὶ τοῖς θεοῖς, τὸ δ' εὐχεσθαι αἰτεῖν τοὺς θεούς;

hope from him; but who worships Brahman, the creator? His work is done.”<sup>17</sup> Fear and the desire to secure favor, which is often only another way of saying the fear of ill consequences, fall far short of the moral possibilities of religion. Now, one service rendered by the thank-offering was that it afforded opportunity for disinterested sacrifice by giving it a rational basis and made it possible to maintain the worship of a non-malevolent deity. In a curious passage of the *de Iside et Osiride*<sup>18</sup> Plutarch says that Zoroaster taught men to offer to Oromasdes *εὐκαταία καὶ χαριστήρια*, to Ahriman *ἀποτρόπαια καὶ σκυθρωπά*. But not every nation has a Zoroaster to direct its religious life, and there are peoples which confine their worship largely to keeping on good terms with evil powers. The logical and very often the actual outcome of this is devil-worship.<sup>19</sup> However, even the deity who received sacrifices of thanksgiving was not always of an unqualifiedly friendly nature. We hear in Dionysius<sup>20</sup> of a sacrifice to Zeus Deimatis after escape from terror, for it was often felt that the god who sent the trouble was best fitted to remove it. Now, the most prominent and most naturally emphasized attribute of such a deity was precisely his need of placation. These untoward aspects were emphasized by the sacrifice of propitiation. On the contrary, the thank-offering, laying stress, as it did, upon the good and benevolent aspects of the divine nature, fostered the conception of a mild and kindly deity, and, further (for such a conception was in itself nothing novel), supplied inducement and encouragement to the active worship of such a deity.

The thank-offering thus contained lofty moral possibilities. But these were not always fully realized. The reason for this was sometimes crass conservatism and immobility. Some of the Dorian stock seem to have been slow to grasp the new idea. The Spartans were particularly remarkable for being the only nation in Greece that offered no sacrifice of thanks-

<sup>17</sup> *India Old and New*, 113. “Not a mere phrase,” adds Professor Hopkins, “for in India to-day there are thousands of temples to Çiva and Vishnu, but only two to Brahman.”

<sup>18</sup> 369 E.

<sup>19</sup> Westermarck, *op. cit.* II, 613 f.

<sup>20</sup> Dion. Hal. vi, 90, 1.

giving for a victory. The reason that was given for this curious fact was, we may be sure, a fanciful invention to flatter Spartan pride. The Spartans, it was said, were so used to victory that they did not consider that such a commonplace event required a sacrifice.<sup>21</sup> The true reason was probably that they had not attained to the notion of a god who required not only the sacrifice of propitiation before battle—they were not so accustomed to battle as to omit this<sup>22</sup>—but a sacrifice of thanksgiving after a conflict; still less had they risen to the idea that such a sacrifice was not demanded by the deity, but was quite fitting as a voluntary expression of gratitude.

For even where the thank-offering had come into being, there was a fatal tendency to think of it as compulsory, to dread disaster from its omission, to drag it back to something allied to an offering of propitiation. I call this tendency fatal because I find in it an important reason why the thank-offering failed to rise to the height of its moral possibilities. Men who had all their lives been subject to the bondage of propitiatory sacrifice to irascible deities might perform a thank-offering in the first flush of grateful consciousness, when the aid of a god had been vouchsafed them at some crisis; but with such religious training as theirs, it was almost inevitable that they should be haunted by the thought, "What will the god do to us if we do not thus acknowledge his aid? He will smite us with disaster. Then let us sacrifice to him that he may not visit his anger upon us." The tone of apprehension is well reproduced in the closing words on the stele dedicated by Xenophon to Artemis: <sup>23</sup> ἀν δέ τις μὴ ποίῃ ταῦτα, τῇ

<sup>21</sup> Plut. *Agesilaus*, 33.

<sup>22</sup> Xenophon in the *Resp. Lac.* 13, 2 f. details the elaborate sacrifices employed by the Spartans before battle; cp. 13, 8 and Paus. IX, 13, 4; Plut. *Lyc.* 22. It is interesting to observe that Plutarch mentions three times a sacrifice to the Muses before battle, so that the warriors may exhibit deeds worthy of mention and glorious recollection (*Inst. Lac.* 238 B; cp. *Lyc.* 21 and *de Cohib. Ira*, 458 E). Worship before battle, however, is very likely to be propitiation. Then, too, any worship of the Muses can scarcely be very ancient at Sparta, for these deities came into Peloponnesus from the north (Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, v, 435 f.). With the citations from Plutarch cp. also Paus. III, 17, 5.

<sup>23</sup> *Anab.* v, 3, 13.

θεῶν μελήσει. An oracle found in the speech of Demosthenes against Meidias<sup>24</sup> imposes a penalty ὅτι τὰς ὥρας παρηνέγκατε τῆς θυσίας καὶ τῆς θεωρίας, and these were apparently offerings of thanksgiving. Arrian<sup>25</sup> catalogues the mishaps that are likely to befall the hunter who forgets Artemis Agrotera and Pan, and he reminds his readers that Teucer lost his contest ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἐπηύξατο τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι. In both these latter instances the writer is probably thinking of a vow<sup>26</sup> made before the hunt and the contest respectively. But as the payment of the vow was often considered a thank-offering, it amounts to saying that Teucer lost his contest because he did not promise to sacrifice a thank-offering if he succeeded, while Meriones won, because he did make such a promise.<sup>27</sup> Already in Homer<sup>28</sup> Artemis sends disaster

χωσαμένη, ὃ οἱ οὐ τι θαλύσια<sup>29</sup> γουνῶ ἀλωῆς  
Οἰνεὺς ῥέξ', ἄλλοι δὲ θεοὶ δαίνυνθ' ἐκατόμβας,

and a curious passage in Plutarch<sup>30</sup> relates that Camillus, having vowed to dedicate a tenth if he should capture Veii, forgot his vow. How far the payment of the vow was considered to be thank-offering is seen from the requirement that he atone for his negligence by thank-offering as well as by propitiation: μάντεις ἡγγελλον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς προφαίνεσθαι θεῶν μῆνιν ἰλασμοῦ καὶ χαριστηρίων δεομένην.

Wundt<sup>31</sup> has remarked that thank-offering and propitiatory offering are one in their object, which is to win God's favor, and certain it is that, so long as thank-offering is felt to be not entirely voluntary, but a duty that must be performed, it is constantly in danger of being degraded to the propitiatory rite from which in certain cases it seems actually to have

<sup>24</sup> XXI, 53.

<sup>25</sup> *Cyneg.* 36, 1 f.

<sup>26</sup> Cp. Aesch. *Sept.* 276 f.: ἐπεύχομαι θήσσειν τροπαῖα, but also Xen. *Cyr.* VIII, 7, 3: ἔθνε . . . ὧδε ἐπενχόμενος . . . δέχεσθε τὰδε καὶ τελεστήρια . . . καὶ χαριστήρια, etc.

<sup>27</sup> Arr. *l.c.*

<sup>28</sup> *Il.* IX, 533 f.

<sup>29</sup> Though not originally thank-offerings, θαλύσια came to be so considered (*T.A.P.A.* XLIII, 97). Whatever their significance in the earliest form of the story, there can be no doubt that, for the average reader of Homer, the narrative was a warning against the omission of the thank-offering.

<sup>30</sup> *Camillus*, 7 fin.

<sup>31</sup> *Mythus und Religion*, II, 338.



sprung.<sup>32</sup> In air so polluted such a delicate emotion as gratitude cannot flourish. If it persists at all, it persists only in combination with less worthy motives, such as the love of display, self-advertisement, or some other form of selfishness. Pausanias declares that he does not know whether the Cnidians built their treasury ἐπὶ νίκη τινι, or to show their prosperity, and we may well suppose that the two motives were often so closely intertwined as to be indistinguishable. Thank-offerings seem to have demanded a less elaborate and costly ritual than the rites of propitiation,<sup>33</sup> and one reason for the spread of the former may have been that they afforded a cheap and easy means of securing the favor of the gods. To the question how he worships the gods to make them his friends, Hermogenes answers:<sup>34</sup> Ναὶ μὰ τὸν Δί' . . . καὶ μάλα εὐτελῶς. Ἐπαινῶ τε γὰρ αὐτοὺς οὐδὲν δαπανῶν, ὧν τε διδῶσιν ἀεὶ αὐτὸν παρέχομαι, εὐφημῶ τε ὅσα αὐτὸν δύνωμαι, etc.

With all this salutary tendency to emphasize and popularize nobler and milder ideas of God, there was, latent or active, a more sinister tendency. That feeling of nervous anxiety towards the unseen, which Fowler calls *religio*,<sup>35</sup> became less prominent; in some cases there arose a feeling of something like familiarity with the gods, and this, especially among the Ionians, sometimes found in the gods the most delicious subjects for burlesque. A poor service to religion would be rendered by any rite that tended to diminish the "sense of dependence" that lies at the root of all religion.<sup>36</sup> But the fundamental sense of dependence is very hard to eliminate, and unquestionably the normal effect of a thank-offering was to hold in the very forefront of consciousness the feeling that all blessings came to man from divine powers<sup>37</sup> and to emphasize rather than to diminish man's sense of his dependence upon them.

<sup>32</sup> *T.A.P.A.* XLIII, 99 f. Cp. Diphilus, frag. 43, 13 f. Kock.

<sup>33</sup> This is not to deny that they could, on occasion, be made very costly and elaborate.

<sup>34</sup> *Xen. Symp.* 4, 49.

<sup>35</sup> *Religious Experience of the Roman People*, 41.

<sup>36</sup> Fiske, *Idea of God*, 62; cp. *Harvard Theol. Rev.* VII, 385.

<sup>37</sup> Plato, *Euthyphro*, 14 E f.

It was probably in public rather than in private worship that the thank-offering took its rise.<sup>38</sup> Certainly the instance in which we can best trace the historical development of a rite of thanksgiving is the public celebration of the victory of Marathon.<sup>39</sup> In many recorded instances it is difficult or impossible to determine whether a given rite was public or private. Here and there the word *δημοσίᾳ*<sup>40</sup> is used, or we are told that an offering takes place on behalf of the senate or the people; but even in such cases the ceremony was sometimes performed by private individuals out of their own resources.<sup>41</sup> There can be no question that, whatever its origin, the rite rapidly won a place in the religious life of the individual<sup>42</sup> and was supported by moral sanctions. Already in Aristophanes<sup>43</sup> it is a just act, that is, an act of common justice, and in Sophocles it is an act of piety. Heracles is made to say: <sup>44</sup> *ὅταν | πορθήτε γαῖαν, εὐσεβεῖν τὰ πρὸς θεούς*, which it is natural to interpret, "do not forget to render the gods their due thank-offering." Sallustius, the Neo-platonist, says,<sup>45</sup> "Since we have received everything from the gods and it is right to pay the giver some tithe of his gifts, we pay such a tithe of possessions in votive offerings, of bodies in gifts of hair and adornment, and of life in sacrifices." Failure to perform thank-offering is branded as impiety and grave dishonor to the gods. In describing the marks of an impious man Apuleius says: *nec dis rurationis . . . segetes ullas aut vitis aut gregis primitias impertit*.<sup>46</sup> It is because the chorus thinks that the mail-clad lord of war may be angry with Ajax for dishonor to his aiding spear<sup>47</sup> that they ask if he has taken such dire vengeance. But sometimes the thank-offering seems to be deemed an act of special virtue, one that preëminently

<sup>38</sup> *T.A.P.A.*, XLIII, 109.<sup>39</sup> *Ib.* 101 f.<sup>40</sup> *E.g.* Dion. Hal. x, 54, 1.<sup>41</sup> Dittenberger, *Syll.* 649, 23 ff.<sup>42</sup> Plato, *Euthyphro*, 14 B: *σφίξει τὰ τοιαῦτα τοὺς τε ἰδίους οἴκους καὶ τὰ κοινὰ τῶν πόλεων*.<sup>43</sup> *Plut.* 840: *ἀνθ' ὧν ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν | προσευξόμενος ἦκω δικαίως ἐνθαδῖ;* cp. 844.<sup>44</sup> *Phil.* 1440 f.<sup>45</sup> *On the Gods and the World*, 16, translated by Murray, *Four Stages of Greek Religion* (p. 208).<sup>46</sup> *Apol.* 56, 519.<sup>47</sup> *Soph. Aj.* 179 ff.

manifests piety, if it does not manifest preëminent piety. Aristides<sup>48</sup> says: τοῖς δὲ θεοῖς πρέποντα χαριστήρια τούτων ἀπήγαγον . . . καὶ φανερὰν ἅπασιν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρετὴν ἦν εἰς τε θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους εἶχον κατέστησαν.

There is some question whether an unsolicited blessing was felt to require a thank-offering. Keller<sup>49</sup> maintains that in Homer there is no clear case of thank-offering for any favor that had not specifically been requested. In view of the close connection between the thank-offering and the payment of the vow, this is nothing other than what we might expect. I have previously<sup>50</sup> expressed my conviction that we find in Homer very little that is unequivocally thank-offering. But when once gratitude to God and its ritual manifestation had become established as moral and religious duties, it was inevitable that thank-offering be paid as much for unexpected and unsolicited benefits as for those that succeeded painful prayer and earnest solicitation,—perhaps even more, for the latter might seem wrung from a half-reluctant deity, the former exhibited God's beneficence at its brightest, undimmed by any cloud of reluctance. Blessings freely given for our pleasure may well arouse the desire to give the gods pleasure in return.

For the gods are pleased with the thank-offering (χαρίεντα δῶρα<sup>51</sup>) as with the dedicatory gift (ἡσθεῖσαι δόσει<sup>52</sup>), perhaps not wholly for the gift itself, but because, as Aelian<sup>53</sup> says, they do not want us to be ungrateful or forgetful. So the offering must be made ungrudgingly and with cheerfulness.

τοιαῦτ' ἐπεύχου μὴ φιλοστόνως θεοῖς.<sup>54</sup>

Especially if one is paying a vow, he has no excuse for denying God his due, when God has fulfilled his part of the contract. It is a very serious matter to pay a whit less than has been vowed. On the other hand, there is no obligation whatever to pay more. Yet on occasion it is not an unhandsome

<sup>48</sup> II, 200, p. 265 Dind.

<sup>49</sup> *Homeric Society*, 128; "prayers were mostly vows," *ib.* 140.

<sup>50</sup> *T.A.P.A.* XLIII, 97.

<sup>51</sup> *Ar. Plut.* 849.

<sup>52</sup> *Anthol. Pal.* VI, 203, 11.

<sup>53</sup> *Frags.* 101.

<sup>54</sup> *Aesch. Sept.* 280.

thing to do. Xenophon says of Agesilaus:<sup>55</sup> καὶ θαρρῶν πλείονα ἔθυνεν, ἢ ὀκνῶν ἡύχετο. The context, with its mention of gratitude (θεοῖς χάριν ἡδεῖ), shows that we are here at the point where the payment of the vow is passing into thank-offering, and the door is ajar that leads to expensive and even extravagant sacrifice as a manifestation of abundant gratitude. But Roman 'canniness' and Greek moderation alike long tended to prevent lavish expenditure in the thank-offering. Μηδὲν ἄγαν. To violate the canon of moderation is evidence of bad taste, of superstition, or even of low-down political trickery and knavery. Ammianus<sup>56</sup> speaks of Julian as *superstitiosus magis quam sacrorum legitimus observator, innumeras sine parsimonia pecudes mactans*, and the sausage-seller and Cleon outbid each other in the magnificence of the thank-offering they would decree to Artemis.<sup>57</sup> Only here and there, probably chiefly in late writers,<sup>58</sup> is expressed the idea that the worth of the rite is connected in any way with the size and beauty of the objects offered, but over against this is set the worthier notion that for the gods' goodness any worthy return is impossible.<sup>59</sup> It is not for pay that the gods benefit us, but they do not want us to be ungrateful or forgetful.<sup>60</sup> The rite is more for our sakes than for theirs. They can dispense with receiving it,<sup>61</sup> but it is not well for man's religious wellbeing to refrain from giving it.

Consequently a ritual of thank-offering is kept up. Sometimes it is obscured by a banquet, but in such cases the fact is, apparently, that the sacrifice has assumed the banquet form. In Greece there could scarcely be a banquet of meat without a sacrifice. The note of rejoicing may obscure the sacrificial aspect but does not eliminate it. In one or two instances there is no mention either of sacrifice or banquet. It would be rash to conclude that the thank-offering had been

<sup>55</sup> *Ages.* 11, 2.

<sup>56</sup> *Amm. Marc.* xxv, 4, 17.

<sup>57</sup> *Ar. Eq.* 654 ff.

<sup>58</sup> *Aristides*, 1, 540, pp. 798 f. *Dind.*, but there is a hint of it in *Soph. El.* 457 f.

<sup>59</sup> *Xen. Mem.* iv, 3, 15.

<sup>60</sup> *Ael. frag.* 101. The pay aspect of the thank-offering is one I hope to discuss on another occasion.

<sup>61</sup> *Plato, Euthyphro*, 15 A, 13 C.

quite deritualized or fully moralized, for in at least one instance<sup>62</sup> the failure to mention ritual act is evidently quite accidental. But it is a distinct encroachment on the ritualistic thank-offering when grateful memory is elevated to the position of an acceptable sacrifice. Doubtless the anniversary character of many of these rites tended to make of them memorials instead of sacrifices; or, since the two aspects are not fundamentally inconsistent, perhaps we should say that the anniversary character tended to bring the memorial aspect into prominence at the expense of the vividness of the emotion of gratitude. Not that the ritual was immediately dropped, but, apparently, the material sacrifice of some animal or other valuable ultimately gave way to the less tangible offering of a grateful memory. In the mysteries of Isis as described by Apuleius,<sup>63</sup> the thanks of the initiate were practically a hymn of praise to the goddess. He recognizes his inability to do much in the way of sacrifice but promises to remember her features and ponder her *numen sanctissimum*. The hymn became an acceptable substitute for sacrifice. Agesilaus, who always thanked the gods for his successes, seems to have preferred to do so by hymns rather than by sacrifices.<sup>64</sup> Aristides<sup>65</sup> is doubtless in error when he says that the first ἀπαρχαί were those of words, but he probably represents his own time with some fidelity when he continues τὰς (ἀπαρχάς) ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων, αἷς ἔτι καὶ νῦν χαίρειν μάλιστα τοὺς θεοὺς λόγος αἰρεῖ.

It can scarcely be doubted that something of the vogue which the thank-offering came to enjoy was due to the jollification to which it so readily lent itself. Only in abnormal and exceptional cases did the sacrifice of propitiation permit the worshippers to partake of the sacrificial meat.<sup>66</sup> Usually

<sup>62</sup> Herod. iv, 136.

<sup>63</sup> *Met.* xi, 25 ff.

<sup>64</sup> Xen. *Ages.* ii, 2. Cf. Plato, *Leges*, 801 E, Porph. *de Abst.* ii, 34. Much later, Synesius, in a passage quoted in 'Stephanus' Lex., but which I have been unable to locate precisely, speaks of hymns not as a substitute for sacrifice but as themselves a species of sacrifice — χαριστηρίους ὕμνους τῷ θεῷ ἀποθύσαντες, ὥσπερ εὐώθμεν.

<sup>65</sup> Aristides, ii, 101, p. 136 Dind; cp. Hebrews, xiii, 15.

<sup>66</sup> Stengel, *Die griechischen Kultusaltertümer*, 119.

it was holocaust, — burned entire to the deity. With the thank-offering, Jewish<sup>67</sup> as well as Greek, it was quite otherwise. There seems good reason to believe that certain forms of thank-offering, *νικητήρια* and *εὐαγγέλια*, were derived from a celebration banquet;<sup>68</sup> certainly banquets held a prominent place in the thanksgiving rite. This is, of course, the point of the efforts made by Cleon and the sausage-seller to outbid each other in the popular favor.<sup>69</sup> The sacrifice was to supply the people with a festal meal. The deity and his grace once formally acknowledged, nothing remained but to enjoy the good things, and as this occupied the larger part of the time, so it came to engage the larger part of the attention. To Diodorus a banquet seems to be an essential, even *the* essential part of the feast.<sup>70</sup> In the festivities attendant upon the healing of Plutus,<sup>71</sup> a good deal is said of banquet and dance, but little or nothing about anything that seems to the modern mind distinctly religious. Of course, in their origin, both sacrificial banquet and dance are religious, but it is not their religious but their social side that is emphasized in our accounts of these ceremonies. The sacrificial side is either quite obscured or is confined to a mere libation to the deity, as in one instance even as early as Homer.<sup>72</sup> It is on the human rejoicing that the stress is laid.<sup>73</sup> We are led to suspect that in many instances the real reason for holding the celebration was not so much to display gratitude as to enjoy a good meal and participate in a general jollification. In certain cases we have no mention of a banquet even; perhaps it was omitted, perhaps it is taken for granted. In such cases we hear much of the dance, especially in Euripides.<sup>74</sup>

<sup>67</sup> Josephus, *Ant.* III, 9, 1.    <sup>68</sup> *T.A.P.A.* XLIII, 109 f.    <sup>69</sup> *Ar. Eq.* 654 ff.

<sup>70</sup> *Diod.* IV, 21, 4: *κατέθυσε . . . πᾶσαν τὴν δεκάτην, εὐωχίας ποιῶν συνεχεῖς καὶ πολυδαπάνους.* XVII, 100, 1: *θύσας . . . σωτήρια μεγάλας ἐστιάσεις τῶν φίλων ἐποιεῖτο;* cf. XVI, 55; XX, 63, 1; XX, 76, 6.

<sup>71</sup> *Ar. Plut.* 288, 644, 761. The just man does bring his old shoes as a dedicatory offering (848 f.)

*χαρίεντά γ' ἡκεῖς δῶρα τῷ θεῷ φέρων.*

<sup>72</sup> *Il.* x, 578 f. Here it has not dwindled, it has not yet developed.

<sup>73</sup> Longus, IV, 25, 2: *θύσαντες Διὶ Σωτῆρι συμπόσιον συνεκρότουν.*

<sup>74</sup> *Eur. El.* 859, 864, 875, *Herc. Fur.* 761 ff.; cf. *Phoen.* 315 ff.

But a passage in the *Ion*<sup>75</sup> makes it pretty clear that in these cases sacrifice and the banquet were not necessarily dispensed with.

The last step in the moralizing of the thank-offering is taken when the principle of Agesilaus, that God is no less pleased with holy deeds than with holy sacrifices, is carried to its logical conclusion. Then, and then only, the path lies open to the conception that the best manifestation of gratitude to God is a good use of what he sends us, that even as the best sacrifice of propitiation is a broken spirit and a contrite heart, so the best sacrifice of thanksgiving is a cheerful spirit and a determination to do the will of the gods.

<sup>75</sup> Eur. *Ion*, 1123 f. and 1130 f.